



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,986	04/20/2005	Gunter Saliger	66489-050	5951

7590 07/13/2007
Dykema Gossett
Suite 300
1300 I Street N W
Washington, DC 20005-3353

EXAMINER

STOKES, CANDICE CAPRI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3732

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,986

Applicant(s)

SALIGER, GUNTER

Examiner

Candice C. Stokes

Art Unit

3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taub et al. (6,334,772) in view of DaSilva et al. (6,419,484). Taub et al. discloses a system and methods for positioning a dental instrument at the correct position on a preparation sight. The methods involve obtaining a virtual image with computing position-dependent surface features of 2D data (i.e. tooth outline in Figs. 5A and 5B) relative to the desired end position of the dental device (Column 2, lines 56-63 and Column 7, lines 33-40). To claim 4, there is also a real image captured of the device and tooth by a camera located on the hand instrument to be used at the preparation site (Fig. 3). In the amended version of claim 4, the limitation "to enable..." is a recitation of intended use. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The two images are superimposed using the surface features to bring the two images to coincidence (Column 2, lines 56-63 and Column 7, lines 33-40). The surface features used to bring the two images into coincidence can also be a horizontal line (Figs. 6, 7A, and 7B). The system for positioning the dental device includes a

Art Unit: 3732

hand instrument with a placement tool (22), a camera (26), and evaluating unit consisting of software for computing the reference features (which can be vectors such as horizontal and vertical lines) (Column 3, lines 43-53). With respect to claim 6, the camera is integrated into the instrument and near the end of the placement tool. As to claim 5, the distance for the placement tool end to the camera is known the depth of focus allows for close viewing and the lens can be a panoramic lens (Column 5, lines 47-50). Further to claim 5, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the camera having a depth of focus from 5 to 30 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Taub et al. does not disclose that the alignment is for positioning and implant into a jaw cavity and that the tool is a machining tool for drilling the cavity. DaSilva et al. discloses using optical fibers adjacent a dental drill for correct positioning of the drill. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and methods of Taub et al., by incorporating a dental drill as the tool in the system for proper placement, as taught by DaSilva, since the methods of aligning the end position of the device are the same and it is known, and important, to keep dental drills within precise locations to avoid nerve damage. With respect to claim 7, the office takes Official Notice that an illumination means, even if they are not directly incorporated into the image capture device are always used in image capturing (i.e. external light sources or natural lighting).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 8 are allowed.

Art Unit: 3732

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Taub et al reference teaches a method for positioning a dental device and the DaSilva et al reference teaches a positioning a dental device as well. Therefore, there is knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine references, which teach positioning dental devices. Thus, claims 4-7 remain rejected.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Candice C. Stokes whose telephone number is (571) 272-4714. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Candice C. Stokes


CRIS RODRIGUEZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700